



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,778	03/24/2004	John Armstrong	EFIM0374	5911
31408 7590 04/23/2008 LAW OFFICE OF JAMES TROSINO 92 NATOMA STREET, SUITE 211 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105				
EXAMINER				
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2151				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/808,778

Applicant(s)

ARMSTRONG ET AL.

Examiner

HASSAN PHILLIPS

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-21 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-21 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed February 11, 2008.

Drawings

2. With regards to the amendments made to the drawings and the specification to correct minor informalities, examiner has withdrawn the objection to the drawings.

Claim Objections

3. With regards to applicant's clarification of the claim language recited in claims 13, 14, and 26, in light of the teachings of applicant's specification, examiner has withdrawn the objection to claims 13, 14 and 26.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed February 11, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued: Spinks does not describe or suggest anything about a network device that includes a registration processor/query processor, wherein the network device is coupled to a first network and is located inside a firewall, and wherein the registration processor/query processor is adapted to provide the information to register the network device on a directory server/request information regarding the first network from a directory server, wherein the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall; Nothing in Hall describes or suggests anything about a network device that is coupled to a first network and is

Art Unit: 2100

located inside a firewall, and that communicates registration information with a directory server that is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall; and, the references actually point away from the claimed invention since the combination of Spinks and Hall would more likely describe a system in which nodes 74, network devices 90, and admin computer 84 are all coupled to a single network 30, and are all located within a firewall to restrict access to end point connection information for security purposes. Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions.

5. With regards to applicant's remarks, as indicated in the previous action, examiner acknowledges Spinks fails to expressly disclose the network device is located inside a firewall, and the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall. Nevertheless, examiner maintains that locating a network device inside a firewall, and coupling a directory server to a third network located outside the firewall were well known features in the art at the time of the present invention. Examiner further maintains that such features are evident in the teachings Hall where Hall discloses a network device (i.e. company device) being located inside a firewall, (pg. 3, par. [0031]), and a directory server (108) coupled to a third network (i.e. a network external to the company network) located outside the firewall, (pg. 3, par. [0028]). Thus, examiner maintains the combination of Spinks and Hall describe a system that reads over applicant's claimed invention. Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the references actually point away from the claimed invention since the combination of Spinks and Hall would more likely describe a system in which

Art Unit: 2100

nodes 74, network devices 90, and admin computer 84 are all coupled to a single network 30, and are all located within a firewall to restrict access to end point connection information for security purposes, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

6. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-16, 18-21, 24- 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spinks et al. (hereinafter Spinks), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0029534, in view of Hall et al. (hereinafter Hall), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0133555.

9. In considering claim 1, Spinks discloses a network device (74, 90, 92, 98) coupled to a first network (30), (see Fig. 2), the network device comprising: information (100) identifying the network device on the first network, (pg. 5, par. [0068]); and a registration processor (88) adapted to provide the identifying information to register the network device on a directory server (84), (pg. 5, par. [0068]).

Although Spinks discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Spinks fails to expressly disclose: wherein the network device is located inside a firewall, and the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall.

Nevertheless, a network device being located inside a firewall, and a directory server being coupled to a third network located outside the firewall, were well known features in the art at the time of the present invention. In analogous teachings, Hall exemplifies this where Hall teaches a network device (i.e. company device) being located inside a firewall, (pg. 3, par. [0031]); and, a directory server (108) coupled to a third network (i.e. a network external to the company network) located outside the firewall, (pg. 3, par. [0028]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Spinks to expressly disclose the network device is located inside a firewall, and the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall. As was known in the art this would have advantageously protected the network device by limiting access to the network device (Hall, pg. 3, par. [0031]), while further allowing for the directory server to be accessed publicly by other network devices outside the

Art Unit: 2100

network of the network device, without compromising the security of the network device, (Hall, pg. 3, par. [0028]).

10. In considering claims 2 and 15, Spinks discloses the network device comprises one of a computer, personal digital assistant, pager, cellular telephone, handheld messaging device, facsimile machine, copier, printer, telephone, security camera, household appliance, vending machine, kiosk, or digital camera, (pg. 4, par.'s [0059], [0061]).

11. In considering claims 3 and 16, Spinks discloses the network device comprises a network printer (92) coupled to the first network and the directory server, (pg. 4, par. [0061], pg. 5, par. [0068], also see Fig. 2).

Although Spinks discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Spinks fails to expressly disclose: the network device comprises one of an inkjet printer, laser printer, wide format printer, or dot matrix printer.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art that a network printer could comprise an inkjet printer, laser printer, wide format printer, or dot matrix printer.

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Spinks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Spinks to expressly disclose the network device comprises one of an inkjet printer, laser printer, wide format printer, or dot matrix printer. As was known in the art, a printer such as a laser printer for example, would provide fast, high quality print outs for a user of the printer. Using such

Art Unit: 2100

a printer in the teachings of Spinks would have allowed for the specific type of printer to register identifying information on the directory server so the printer may be found, in case the physical location of the printer changes for example, (Spinks, pg. 2, par.'s [0016]- [0018]).

12. In considering claims 5 and 18, Spinks discloses the network device further comprises a network connection (26, 28) for coupling to the first network, (pg. 3, par. [0047]).

13. In considering claims 6 and 19, Spinks discloses "any network 30, 50 may be part of, and connect to the Internet 64", (pg. 4, par. [0058]), and "a system 70 may be installed at a network site 72, which may be an office or building belonging to an organization or the like", (pg. 4, par. [0059]).

Although Spinks discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Spinks fails to expressly disclose: the first network comprises a local area network.

Nevertheless, local area networks were well known in the art at the time of the present invention for connecting personal computers, printers and other devices inside buildings or on campuses for example.

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Spinks, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Spinks to expressly disclose the first network comprises a local area network. As was known in the art, this would have advantageously provided a network that was personal and/or specifically used for a

company or organization. Using such a network in the teachings of Spinks would have provided a device registration process that would allow for a device in a local area network to be found, in case the physical location of the device changes for example, (Spinks, pg. 2, par.'s [0016]- [0018]).

14. In considering claims 7 and 20, Spinks discloses the first network comprises a plurality of interconnected networks (30, 50), (pg. 4, par. [0060]).

15. In considering claims 8 and 21, Spinks discloses the first network is coupled to a second network (64) that comprises any of a wide area network, global network, public network, or the Internet, (pg. 4, par. [0058]).

16. In considering claims 11 and 24, Spinks discloses the identifying information comprises an address, (pg. 6, par. [0084]).

17. In considering claim 12, Spinks discloses the identifying information comprises an address of the network device on the first network, (pg. 6, par. [0084]).

18. In considering claims 13 and 26, Spinks discloses the first network is coupled to a second network (50) (pg. 4, par. [0060]), and the identifying information comprises an address of the first network on the second network, (pg. 6, par. [0084]).

19. In considering claim 14, Spinks discloses a network device (74, 90, 92, 98) coupled to a first network (30), (see Fig. 2), the network device comprising: information (100) identifying the network device on the first network, (pg. 5, par. [0068]); and a query processor (166) adapted to request information regarding the first network from a directory server (84), (pg. 6, par. [0081]).

Although Spinks discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Spinks fails to expressly disclose: wherein the network device is located inside a firewall, and the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall.

Nevertheless, a network device being located inside a firewall, and a directory server being coupled to a third network located outside the firewall, were well known features in the art at the time of the present invention. In analogous teachings, Hall exemplifies this where Hall teaches a network device (i.e. company device) being located inside a firewall, (pg. 3, par. [0031]); and, a directory server (108) coupled to a third network (i.e. a network external to the company network) located outside the firewall, (pg. 3, par. [0028]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Spinks to expressly disclose the network device is located inside a firewall, and the directory server is coupled to a third network and is located outside the firewall. As was known in the art this would have advantageously protected the network device by limiting access to the network device (Hall, pg. 3, par. [0031]), while further allowing for the directory server to be accessed publicly by other network devices outside the

network of the network device, without compromising the security of the network device, (Hall, pg. 3, par. [0028]).

20. In considering claim 25, Spinks discloses the information comprises an address of a second network device on the first network, (pg. 6, par.'s [0081], [0084]).

21. Claims 4, 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spinks in view of Hall and further in view of Tamura, U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0133678.

22. In considering claims 4 and 17, although Spinks discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Spinks fails to expressly disclose: the network device comprises an Internet protocol telephone.

Nevertheless, Internet protocol telephones were well known in the art at the time of the present invention. In analogous teachings, Tamura exemplifies this where in a description of the prior art Tamura indicates networking trends have expanded to Internet protocol telephones among other devices, (pg. 1, par. [0005]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Spinks to expressly disclose the network device comprises an Internet protocol telephone. This would have advantageously allowed for networking with more devices including the Internet protocol telephone, (Tamura, pg. 1, par. [0005]). This also would have allowed for finding the Internet protocol telephone, in case the physical

location of the Internet protocol telephone changes for example, (Spinks, pg. 2, par.'s [0016]- [0018]).

Conclusion

23. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **HASSAN PHILLIPS** whose telephone number is (571)272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2100

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hassan Phillips
Examiner, Art Unit 2151
/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151